

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

CARMEN N. WATSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Case No. 19-1044-EFM
)	
USD NO. 500, KANSAS CITY, KANSAS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

ORDER

Defendant has filed a motion to compel plaintiff's initial disclosures (ECF No. 98). The scheduling order required plaintiff to serve her initial disclosures by September 16, 2019 (ECF No. 91). Defense counsel reached out to plaintiff regarding her failure to meet the disclosure deadline. Plaintiff indicated in her e-mail response that defense counsel did not have permission to obtain any information about her and she would not be available for over a month to participate in a telephonic status conference (ECF Nos. 98-2 and 98-3).

Plaintiff did not file any response to defendant's motion to compel. Under the time requirements set forth in D. Kan. Rule 6.1(d), any response to the motion to compel was due on October 23, 2019. No timely opposition has been filed. D. Kan. Rule 7.4(b) provides, "If a responsive brief or memorandum is not filed within the D. Kan. Rule 6.1(d) time requirements, the court will consider and decide the motion as an uncontested motion. Ordinarily, the court will grant the motion without further notice." The court therefore grants defendant's unopposed motion.

On or before **November 14, 2019**, plaintiff is directed to serve her initial disclosures. The court reiterates plaintiff's responsibility to timely comply with the requirements of the scheduling order and to move this case toward resolution.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated October 31, 2019, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ James P. O'Hara
James P. O'Hara
U. S. Magistrate Judge